

Senate

MONDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1969

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

"Not alone for mighty empire, stretching
far o'er land and sea;
Not alone for bounteous harvests, lift
we up our hearts to Thee.
Standing in the living present, memory
and hope between,
Lord, we would with deep thanksgiving,
praise Thee most for things un-
seen."

—WILLIAM P. MERRILL.

As we praise Thee, Lord, for things unseen, we ask Thy presence with us in the daily duties which are seen. Make us apt and able for this day. When we are weak, make us strong. When we have fear, give us courage. When we are lonely, be our companion. And enable us so to work and live that we may be used by Thee for the making of a better Nation and the establishment of Thy kingdom among all men. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, November 26, 1969, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICAN INVOLVEMENT IN THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Senator SYMINGTON's subcommittee recently completed a series of hearings concerning American involvement in the Philippines. Although substantial portions of those hearings were deleted by the Department of Defense for security purposes, there still is a tremendous amount of new information now being made public for the first time.

Ward Just, of the Washington Post, did a brief summary of some of the more interesting parts of the subcommittee hearings, and it was published in the Washington Post of Sunday, November 30.

I hope my colleagues will read this article and that it will encourage other members of the press to take a more careful look at the published hearings of the Symington subcommittee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Ward Just article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OUR AFFAIR WITH THE PHILIPPINES

(By Ward Just)

In the fall of 1966, to a certain amount of fanfare in the United States, the Philippines sent a detachment of 2,200 men to South Vietnam to fight the war. The unit was known as PHILCAG—Philippines Civic Action Group—and was cited by the Johnson administration as yet another example of the support the American position had from "the free world" on the rim of Asia. At the time, President Johnson expressed his "deep satisfaction" and that of the American people at the evidence of Filipino support. President Ferdinand Marcos, addressing a Joint Session of Congress in Washington, proposed an American defensive shield for non-Communist Asia. He told the Congress: "Our object must be to hold the line in Vietnam and at least to roll back Communist power behind the 17th parallel."

To anyone who looked closely at it (and there were a few who did), the Marcos posi-

tion seemed a speck contradictory. If he felt so strongly about rolling back Communist power, why was he committing only 2,200 troops to South Vietnam, and noncombatants at that? Why were Americans not using Clark Air Base to fly bombing missions against South Vietnam?

Well, now we have some of the answers from Senator Symington's Subcommittee on United States Security Agreements and Commitments Abroad, whose report on the Philippines was made public last week (reports on Thailand, Taiwan, and Laos will follow). It is an extraordinary document, mined with wonderful ironies and absurdities all of which combine to throw the United States into a lover's embrace with a country whose people probably don't want us around at all, and a government whose principal preoccupation is cash. And PHILCAG? The short answer is that the Johnson administration bought it lock, stock and barrel for payments totaling about \$38 million. But that is only the tip of the iceberg.

The testimony shows that the U.S. bound to the Philippines in a cat's cradle of alliance. Some of this is based on the SEATO treaty, some of it bilateral, related to (1) the maintenance of our own bases and (2) the supposed threat from China or the Soviet Union; other parts are based on the internal problems caused by the half-Communist, half-gangster apparatus of the Huks; still others appear to be obligations relating to PHILCAG. It is extremely difficult to sort out which threat relates to which commitment, and vice versa. Is the air base at Macatan (maintained at \$4 million a year, it has six sorties a day by U.S. aircraft, but is used by Philippine commercial airlines) kept as an auxiliary in case of Communist attack, as a payoff for Clark and Subic Bay, as a quid pro quo for PHILCAG, or merely because it is there? Similarly, the Huks. There was this exchange between Senator Symington and Lt. Gen. Robert H. Warren, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for military assistance and sales:

Warren: (The U.S. aid) is also to help the Filipino forces to physically protect American forces (in the Philippines).

Symington: From whom?

Warren: Internally, sir; to maintain internal security and stability and, thereby, make our own activities over there more secure.

Symington: In other words we are paying the Philippine government to protect us from the Philippine people who do not agree with the policies of the government or who do not like Americans?

Warren: To a degree, yes, sir.

That U.S. aid included payment for a battalion of Philippine troops whose casualties in pursuit of the dreaded Huks have been less than a dozen, and many of those in nonwar-related activities.

The Americans had supplied the Marcos government with a squadron of 22 F-5 fighter aircraft (cost: \$15 million), and the rationale for that was that the Philippines would then be able to defend itself against attack. There was this exchange between Symington and Lt. Gen. Francis G. Gideon, commander of the American 13th Air Force at Clark Air Base:

Symington: . . . Who would attack the Philippines from the air?

Gideon: The current principal threats are the Chicoms air force and the U.S.S.R.

S 15141

S15142

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

December 1, 1969

Symington: Where would the Soviet planes come from . . . ?

Gideon: Well, there are five or six bases . . .

Symington: What type plane would they use? They would have to use Bears or Bisons (two types of Soviet long-range aircraft).

Gideon: Yes, sir.

Symington: That is a pretty theoretical danger. That plane is comparable to the old B-36. I imagine that danger scares you all pretty bad. What would you do as they went by places like Okinawa? Wave at them?

What emerges from this hearing is that the United States is paying the Philippines for the privilege of defending it against attack. Apart from the \$38 million for PHILCAG, there is \$22.5 million a year for military assistance, and beyond that the very considerable boost to the Philippine economy from the American bases—air force bases at Clark, Mactan, and John Hay, and naval bases at Subic, Sangley and San Miguel, among others. In all, there are 20 American military stations in the Philippines, which pump an estimated \$150 million a year into the economy. This is what has resulted from a treaty in 1947 which said that the two countries would act to meet outside threats "in accordance with its constitutional processes." By 1964, the language had escalated to a point where an attack on the Philippines would be considered by the United States as an attack upon itself and, as such, "instantly repelled." The bases grew along with the language, each keeping pace with the other and none of it reviewed by the Congress—which should have.

That would seem to be the point of PHILCAG. As Senator Fulbright put it: "My own feeling is that all we did was go out and hire the soldiers in order to support our then-administration's view that so many people were in sympathy with our war in Vietnam, and we paid a very high price for it." What is not generally understood about the Symington hearings is that an extraordinary amount of spadework has been needed to pry out what facts there are about our commitment to the Philippines. As it is, there are about two dozen blank pages in the report with only the word [deleted] to indicate what they contain. In fact, they are investigative summaries of theft, assault, murder and homicide around the American bases.

The Philippine commitment acquired a momentum of its own, of a depth and variety out of all proportion to the need—as the military witnesses before the committee candidly conceded. State Department officials with a stake in past policy, military officials with their hardware to deploy—all of them collaborated in the lover's embrace which costs the taxpayer upwards of—what?—\$30 million a year, \$50 million?

And what of PHILCAG?

An American official with wide experience in South Vietnam was queried on the matter the other day, and replied, "Oh yes, PHILCAG. They operated in Tay Ninh Province. They, ah, built one Potemkin village, which was largely to impress VIPs. They were very active in the PX. I think they built some roads . . ."

The official might have added that in three years, the unit lost 8 killed and 17 wounded in an area considered hostile. Only recently, apparently anticipating the Symington Committee report, President Marcos announced that the unit was being withdrawn. He also said that there were no American payments for the maintenance of the unit in South Vietnam. Someone ought to look into that. Where did the \$38 million go?

THE SONG MY INCIDENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Miss Mary McGrory, one of the best commentators in Washington, has written two

perceptive and sensitive articles about the massacres of Song My.

One article is entitled "Silence Greets Viet Massacres." The silence is, I believe, temporary, and is due to the revulsion, the horror, with which most Americans regard this ominous reversion to primitive savagery.

I am confident that the vast majority of our people are revolted by this occurrence and will use their influence to bring this tragic conflict to an early termination.

I ask unanimous consent to have the articles printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SILENCE GREETS VIET MASSACRES

The reaction to reports of mass murder in a Vietnam village by American GIs has been outrage in London, silence in Washington and dismissal in Saigon.

In Britain, the alleged atrocities have created a government crisis and Harold Wilson summoned Ambassador John Freeman home to help him avert a debate on U.S. Vietnam policy in the House of Commons.

The Army announced that Lt. William J. Calley Jr. will face court-martial on charges of killing "109 Oriental human beings, occupants of the village of My Lai." The South Vietnamese government repeated its contention that "no massacre occurred."

The President gave out three Medals of Honor, and chatted with the returned astronauts. The Senate debated the tax bill and the House of Representatives talked about a subway system for the District of Columbia.

Two requests have been made for investigations by military committees of Congress. The public, busy writing letters in support of Vice President Agnew's attack on the press, has not been heard from.

The grisly story is being told in bits and pieces, as GIs around the country stand up to tell what they know about an event that was kept secret by the Army for 20 months.

Last night, a former GI named Paul Meadlo told a CBS audience that he had shot "about 15 or 20 villagers—and babies" under specific orders from Lt. Calley. He felt it was the right thing at the time because he had lost "a damned good buddy, Bobby Wilson," but later felt, after he had stepped on a land mine that God had punished him. It has been on his conscience.

The country's conscience, so far, has not been touched, by these and other recitals. The indignation is all imported. It could be a case of "all passion spent." The last weeks have brought the President's speech, the peace demonstrations, the hardening of attitudes. Is the public resigned, callous or indifferent, to an incident that has been compared in the European press to the Nazi savagery at Lidice? Is it an inability or a refusal to believe that American GIs would kill women and children in cold blood?

Even the bare charges against Lt. Calley do some damage to the President's contention that our continued presence is imperative to avert a "bloodbath." Already the Sept. 26 boast that "we have reversed world public opinion" is eroded.

The Pentagon has withheld comment "to avoid prejudicing the lieutenant's case. But it withheld publication of the incident since March 1968. Its first investigation led to the current Saigon conclusion that it was artillery fire. Its second was precipitated by the personal inquiry of Richard Ridenhour, a Vietnam veteran now studying at California's Claremont College. Neither a participant nor a witness, Ridenhour interviewed other GIs who knew about "Pink-

ville" and reported his findings in letters to high government officials, including Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird.

The story was broken by Seymour M. Hersh, a 32-year-old Washington free-lance writer, who was brought up in Chicago's "Front Page" school of newspapering. Hersh, a fast-talking, fast-moving former Pentagon reporter with the Associated Press, was briefly Sen. Eugene McCarthy's campaign press secretary, and is the author of a book about chemical and biological warfare.

Hersh is against the war, but resents a London newspaper's designation of him as a "left-wing nut." He first heard of "Pinkville" through the tip of an old friend in the Pentagon who told him early in October merely that "the Army has a man in court-martial at Fort Benning, and they have accused him of killing 75 Vietnamese civilians."

Hersh was "horrified," dropped work on a book about the Pentagon, "The Ultimate Corporation," and started out on the trail. He got the name of George W. Latimer, Calley's counsel, flew to Salt Lake City to talk to him.

He got no specifics from Latimer, only "a sense of the dimensions of the story." He applied for and got a \$1,000 grant from the Philip M. Stern Foundation for investigative journalism and started flying around the country to find sources.

He went to Fort Benning and tramped around for two days before he found Lt. Calley, who in a lengthy talk told him, "I'm for the Army." He wrote his first account on Nov. 13. The next day, Ridenhour called the Los Angeles Times and told them he had much more information. Ridenhour had offered his story to Life and Newsweek which had turned it down. Hersh dashed to Los Angeles to talk to Ridenhour, who gave him the names of the GIs he had interviewed.

Meantime, Hersh also visited hawks on military committees on Capitol Hill—"doves are never told anything." They had heard of Pinkville and believed it, but advised him not to write anything because "it won't do much good for the Army."

Hersh had, from his Pentagon days, no trouble believing that the "Army could know about a case like this and was proceeding to do nothing about it."

"They were shipping nerve gas around like it was going out of style, running it through the countryside without telling people, at night, through cities. I thought it was an unspeakable act."

Hersh thinks that the country is suffering a delayed reaction to the horrors now unfolding, partly due to the official denials.

"But this is so clear," he says, "we're doing exactly the things we went into the war to stop."

WHERE OUR CONSCIENCE DIED

Song My has revealed the full devastation of the war. Song My has told us not only what Americans have done to Vietnam but what Vietnam has done to Americans. The country's conscience, apparently, died in that Asian village with the old men, the women and the children.

The reaction to the reports of mass murder by American soldiers has been not horror at what happened, but rage at the messengers who are bringing the news.

The South Vietnamese government, anxious to save the American presence, says it never happened. And, until today, the American government, anxious to save the war, had said nothing.

An administration which fulminated at length against even the prospect of violence on Pennsylvania Avenue during the recent peace march, seemed reluctant to comment about slaughter in Song My.

Before today, the one expression from an administration official was given behind closed doors. Secretary of Defense Melvin R.

Ambassador to Philippines Tries to Heal

By AMANDO E. DORONILA
 Special to The Star

MANILA — Ambassador Henry A. Byroade says that Philippine-American relations are "in trouble . . . that can become serious if nothing is done about it."

Byroade gave a major policy speech here yesterday amid rising Philippine antagonism against the United States over the Symington subcommittee report which has been officially regarded here as highly critical of the Philippines.

Byroade's speech appeared to be an effort to end the hostility and to set an amicable mood for coming negotiations between Manila and Washington over their military and economic agreements.

"I think we should face up to the fact that there are some problems in our relations that are not superficial and that have more deep-seated, serious roots," he said.

"We should bring our problems out into the open and look

at them with a clear, objective light."

He told Filipinos that the report by a U.S. Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee headed by Sen. Stuart Symington, D-Mo., included statements which "were unfortunate and uncomplimentary" . . . they were made by but two out of 535 members of our Congress.

"As such they do not represent the views of all members of the Senate committee, much less the Senate as a whole the Congress,

or the rest of the U.S. government."

Presumably, the two members Byroade referred to were Symington and to the Foreign Relations Committee chairman, Sen. J. William Fulbright, D-Ark.

The Senate report, among other things, said that the United States had financed the 1,500-man Filipino contingent in South Vietnam. Fulbright called this "the ultimate in corruption."

Byroade tried to soothe ruffled

Rift Over Symington Report

feelings here over the Symington report's suggestion that the Filipino force in Vietnam was a mercenary one.

"Many bitter things have been said about the arrangements for the support" of the Filipinos in Vietnam, Byroade said. "In every war in this century that it has fought, the United States has shared its resources with its allies."

He said the word "mercenary" dishonors "not only Philcag (the Filipino unit) but also the

whole concept of allies banding together — sharing together — in dealing with a situation of interest and concern to all."

He said, "It seems to me that irritation over the nature of this testimony has somehow made

Philcag the symbol of U.S.-Philippine tension and obscured the fact that it is a group of dedicated professional men and

women, worthy representatives of the Republic of the Philippines, helping a neighbor in its hour of need."